

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated May 5, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 5, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 20-40 remain pending in the application after entry of this response. Claims 1-19 have been cancelled. Claims 20-38 stand rejected by the Examiner. Claims 39-40 have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the pending claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim Objections

Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 2, "handle and the handle and a portion of the shank" is confusing and should be --handle, and wherein the handle and a portion of the shank--.

Applicant has amended claim 29 to overcome this rejection and respectfully request removal of the objection.

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 2, "the tool, the tool comprising" is confusing and should be --a tool comprising--; and line 4 "a body, the body comprising a pair of apertures" should be --a body with a pair of apertures--.

Applicant has amended claim 31 to overcome this rejection and respectfully request removal of the objection.

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 5, "second cable" should be -- second cable tie--.

Applicant has amended claim 38 to overcome this rejection and respectfully request removal of the objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 20 the word "tool" was not positively recited in the preamble, and the limitation "the two portions" was without sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 20 to overcome this rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In claim 31 the word "tool" was not positively recited in the preamble. Applicant has amended claim 31 to overcome this rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20-23 and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,425,482 to *Chiang*.

Regarding claim 20, the Examiner states that *Chiang* discloses "the body (40b) comprising a planar portion (40b) and a tool fastening mechanism (43b –lower portion). . . wherein a tool fastening mechanism comprising a planar surface (44b) offset from the planar portion for receiving a head of the tool between the surface and the portion; a recess (49b) formed in the surface; a pair of openings (72b) disposed . . . in the recess."

The surface 44(b) in *Chiang*, however, is not a flat planar surface, but is rather arcuate, as shown in Figure 11. Additionally, the openings 79b, in *Chiang* are disposed in the body 40b not in the recess 49b. The only thing disposed in the recess 79b is the tool, as shown in Figures 3-6, 8, 10 and 12. Therefore, *Chiang* does not teach, show, or suggest a planar surface offset from the planar portion for receiving a head of the tool between the surface and the portion, a recess formed in the surface, a pair of openings disposed through the fastening mechanism, wherein the pair of openings is disposed in the recess as recited in claim 20 and claims 21-23 and 25-30 which depend therefrom.

Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 20-23 and 25-30 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 31, *Chiang* does not disclose a cable tie disposed through holes in the tool. The tool in *Chiang* comprises of a handle and a shank extending from the handle, and does not include an opening therethrough. Therefore, *Chiang* does not teach, show or suggest a cable tie disposed through the holes, the opening, and the apertures, wherein the cable tie is tight, thereby securing the fastening mechanism, the tool, and the body together as recited in claim 31 and claims 32-38. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 31-38 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chiang* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,295,422 to *Chow*. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chiang* '482 in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,688,955 to *Ruey-Zon*.

Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 31. As stated above, Applicant believes that claim 31 is in condition for allowance and thus claims 36 and 37 are also in condition for allowance.

New Claims


New independent claims 39 and 40 have been added. Claim 39 is allowable claim 24 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claim 40 is allowable claim 38 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 39 and 40 are in condition for allowance.

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. OLYM/0091.P1

Conclusion

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants